

# Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary

Application No.

09/847,384

Applicant(s)

HOVINEN ET AL.

Examiner

Patrick T. Lewis

Art Unit

1623

## All Participants:

(1) Patrick T. Lewis.

(2) James Lydon.

Status of Application: Non-Final Rejection

(3) \_\_\_\_\_

(4) \_\_\_\_\_

Date of Interview: 5 March 2004

Time: 12:00

## Type of Interview:

☒ Telephonic

☐ Video Conference

☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No  
If Yes, provide a brief description:

## Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

*USC 112, first and second paragraphs*

Claims discussed:

*14-32*

Prior art documents discussed:

*Latva et al. Journal of Luminescence (1997), Vol. 75, pages 149-169.*

## Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:  
*See Continuation Sheet*

## Part III.

- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

  
(Examiner/SPE Signature)

\_\_\_\_\_  
(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner and Mr. Lydon discussed several possible amendments to the claims in order to put the case in condition for allowance; however, no agreement could be met. Mr. Lydon was agreeable to several of the examiners's suggestions (the examiner also showed efforts to compromise), but no agreement could be reached in regards to the scope of the variable G as instantly claimed..